

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.                                     | FILING DATE   | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.     | CONFIRMATION NO. |  |
|---|---------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|
| 10/629,614 07/30/2003                               |               | Won-Youl Choi        | 277/006                 | 6106             |  |
| 75  | 90 09/01/2006 | 01/2006              |                         | EXAMINER         |  |
| LEE & STERBA, P.C. Suite 2000 1101 Wilson Bouleyard |               |                      | SCHINDLER, DAVID M      |                  |  |
|   |               |                      | ART UNIT                | PAPER NUMBER     |  |
| Arlington, VA 22209                                 |               |                      | 2862                    |                  |  |
|   |               |                      | DATE MAILED: 09/01/2006 |                  |  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) |   |
|-----------------|--------------|---|
| 10/629,614      | CHOI ET AL.  |   |
| Examiner        | Art Unit     | _ |
| David Schindler | 2862         |   |

|  | David Schindler  | 2862   |   |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe  | ars on the cover sheet with the o  | orrespondence add  | ress  |  |  |  |  |
| THE REPLY FILED <u>04 August 2006</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AF   | PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR  | ALLOWANCE.   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:   | ving replies: (1) an amendment, aft<br>tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in   | fidavit, or other evider<br>compliance with 37 C           | nce, which<br>FR 41.31; or (3)              |  |  |  |  |
| a) $\boxtimes$ The period for reply expires $\underline{5}$ months from the mailing date   | of the final rejection.  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or ( TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 76   | ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THI   | g date of the final rejecti                                | on.   |  |  |  |  |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL | on which the petition under 37 CFR 1. tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply original than three months after the mailing da  | of the fee. The appropr inally set in the final Office.    | iate extension fee<br>ice action; or (2) as |  |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp<br/>filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter<br/>a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed</li> </ol>   | nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to  | o avoid dismissal of th                                    |   |  |  |  |  |
| AMENDMENTS   | ha muian ka kha wlaka af filima a buiaf  | Cudlinat ha antarad h                                      |   |  |  |  |  |
|  | 3.   ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below): |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| <ul><li>(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet<br/>appeal; and/or</li></ul>   | ter form for appeal by materially re   | ducing or simplifying                                      | the issues for                              |  |  |  |  |
| (d) They present additional claims without canceling a   | corresponding number of finally rej  | jected claims.   |   |  |  |  |  |
| NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1  | , -  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.13   |  | mpliant Amendment  | (PTOL-324).                                 |  |  |  |  |
| <ol><li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)</li></ol>  |  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s).  | · _  | ·  | _   |  |  |  |  |
| 7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is profile that status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:   |  | II be entered and an e                                     | explanation of                              |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) objected to:  |  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>1 and 17-31</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:   |  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE  |  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu<br/>because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and<br/>was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>   | t before or on the date of filing a N<br>d sufficient reasons why the affidat  | otice of Appeal will <u>no</u><br>vit or other evidence is | ot be entered<br>s necessary and            |  |  |  |  |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing<br>entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of<br>showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary   | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appe   | al and/or appellant fa                                     | ils to provide a                            |  |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</li> </ol>   | n of the status of the claims after e  | ntry is below or attacl                                    | hed.  |  |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered bu<br/><u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ol>  | t does NOT place the application i   | n condition for allowa                                     | nce because:                                |  |  |  |  |
| 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).   | (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper <b>f</b>   | Vo(s)  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 13.  Other:  |  | EDWARD LEFKOW  | VITZ  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Pervisory patent i<br>rechnology cente                     | EXAMINER                                    |  |  |  |  |

Continuation of 3 and 11. NOTE: With regard to Section 6 on page 3 of the Remarks, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Claim 28 appears to introduce new matter as the original disclosure does not appear to support a pick-up coil alternately winding a core in a figure-eight pattern.

Additionally, the Examiner notes that Claims 20, 22, 23, 24, and 25 appear to introduce new matter. As all claims appear to contain a similar issue, Claim 20 will be used as an example. The phrase "the second excitation coil portion winds around one of the bar-type portions of the first parallel of bar-type portions of the second soft magnetic core and the second pick-up coil portion winds around the other of the bar-type portions of the first parallel pair of bar-type portions of the second soft magnetic core" on lines 8-12 appears to introduce new matter. Specifically, the use of the phrase "the first parallel pair" in the above phrase appears to be incorrect. Note that if the first excitation coil portion winds around one of the bar-type portions of the first parallel pair of bar type portions of the first magnetic core (lines 3-4 of claim 20), and if the first parallel pair of bar-type portions extend along the first axial direction (lines 2-3 of Claim 17), and given Applicant's Figures 5A-5F, then it appears that the second excitation coil portion winds around one of the bar-type portions of the second parallel pair of bar-type portions of the second soft magnetic core, and not the first parallel pair as claimed. Note that the second parallel pair of bar-type portions extends along the second axial direction (lines 3-4 of Claim 17), and that the second axial direction is perpendicular to the first axial direction (lines 10-11 of Claim 1). Finally, Claim 30 appears to contain new matter in that the excitation coil portions are claimed to wind around both bar-type portions of either the first parallel or second parallel pair of bar-type portions of the first and second magnetic core, respectively, together in a solenoid pattern (see lines 9-14); however, this claimed feature does not appear to be supported by the original disclosure. Note for example applicant's Figure 1 and paragraph [0009] of page 3 of Applicant's specification in which it appears that the excitation coil winds each side of the rectangular ring in a solenoid pattern, but does not wind the two bars together in a solenoid pattern. It is respectfully requested that Applicant review the claims and correct all instances of new matter.